

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are pending. Claim 1 has been canceled. Claims 2-9 have been amended. Claims 21-24 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,542,905 to Fogel ("Fogel") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,358 to Matthews ("Matthews") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,192,360 to Dumais et al. ("Dumais"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Decision on Appeal, the Board agreed with the Examiner that the claim does not limit the manner of evaluation of the initial probability of the first hypothesis as described on page 3 of the Appeal Brief. Accordingly, claim 1 has been canceled and claim 21 has been added that more particularly recites the method of determining the source of an error, similar to the discussion on page 3 of the Appeal Brief. It is respectfully submitted that Fogel, Matthews, and Dumais, alone or in combination, do not teach each and every element of the pending claims. Matthews determines the highest probability hypothesis, which does not evaluate an initial hypothesis after data is received. Further, Matthews's determination of the probability that a fault occurred does not evaluate the initial probability to determine the likelihood that a change is the result of an error. Dumais merely recites the use of a Bayesian network, but does not teach the recited claim limitations.

Thus, neither Fogel, Matthews, nor Dumais, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every limitation of claim 21. Because independent claim 21 is patentable over Fogel, Matthews, and Dumais for the reasons stated above, claims 2-9 and 21-24 are patentable over the cited art for the same reasons stated above. Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

The undersigned representative respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution might be advanced by discussing the application with the undersigned representative, in person or over the telephone, we welcome the opportunity to do so. In addition, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 20, 2011

By: /Eric Sophir, Reg. No. 48,499/

Eric Sophir  
Registration No. 48,499  
SNR Denton US LLP  
1301 K Street, NW  
Suite 600, East Tower  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 408-6470